

New-York Tribune.

MONDAY, APRIL 6, 1914.

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, a New York corporation. Office: 150 Nassau street, New York. Editor: Walter H. Wood. Secretary and Treasurer: Address Tribune Building, No. 154 Nassau street, New York.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York.
Daily and Sunday, 1 mo. \$3.00
Daily and Sunday, 3 mos. \$8.00
Daily and Sunday, 6 mos. \$15.00
Daily and Sunday, 1 year \$28.00
Sunday only, 1 year \$12.00

FOREIGN RATES.—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York.
Daily and Sunday, 1 mo. \$4.00
Daily and Sunday, 3 mos. \$10.00
Daily and Sunday, 6 mos. \$18.00
Daily and Sunday, 1 year \$32.00
Sunday only, 1 year \$14.00

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Mail Matter.

The Tribune uses its best endeavors to insure the truthfulness of every advertisement it prints and to avoid the publication of any advertisements containing misleading statements or claims.

Republican Senators Should Not Play Politics with the Canal Tolls Issue.

The Tribune's Washington dispatches say that Republican Senators who had been counted upon to support the Sims canal tolls exemption repeal bill are succumbing to the temptation to make cheap partisan capital out of the split in the Democratic party between the repealers and the anti-repealers. They are being urged to widen the split by opposing the President and playing into the hands of Underwood, Clark, Hearst and Tammany. On some questions it is natural to expect politicians to play politics. But petty ambitions to put one faction or another of the opposition "in a hole" should be repressed when it comes to dealing with international relations. Honorable men of all parties should stand together on an issue involving the scrupulous observance of the country's treaty obligations.

The exemption of coastwise shipping from canal tolls would never have been authorized by Congress had the Democratic party not been willing to abandon its anti-subsidy convictions in order to make trouble for a Republican President. President Taft was sore beset in 1912. He did not want to sign a Panama Canal act remitting tolls to coastwise shipping and thus raising a question of bad faith with Great Britain. At the same time, he did not want to see canal legislation sacrificed. The Democrats and the hostile Progressive Republicans in Congress saw a chance to put him "in a hole" and gladly seized it. Mr. Taft signed the bill as a choice of evils, but only after vainly urging Congress to give foreigners who thought the tolls exemption a discrimination against them the right to test the question in the United States courts.

Eleven Republican Senators stood out on August 7, 1912, against leading down the Panama Canal act with a tolls exemption proviso. If their attitude was right then, why should it be any the less right now? Of the eleven nine are still members of the Senate—Messrs. Brandegee, Burton, Fall, Gronna, Lodge, Nelson, Oliver, Penrose and Root. It is reported that Messrs. Fall, Oliver and Penrose are disposed to reverse themselves, on the ground that partisan advantage would accrue from the defeat of the Sims bill and the consequent shattering of President Wilson's prestige.

We cannot see how the Republican party would be benefited by so cold blooded a subordination of national honor and integrity to temporary partisan profit. Republican Senators should not be willing to gamble with this country's reputation for good faith. Those who in 1912 attacked discrimination in favor of our coastwise trade as vicious would discredit themselves by favoring discrimination now simply as a means of aggravating a feud within the Democratic party.

The Republicans in the Senate are bound by no platform declaration in favor of tolls exemption. They are free to do what they think is right and best for the country. Some of them are strong believers in ship subsidies, and would like to strain a point to vote indirect aid from the Treasury to the coastwise lines, whether such aid is really needed or not. But we are satisfied that the Republican party as a whole favors maintaining the national honor first and encouraging shipping afterward. It would have good cause to deplore the shortsightedness of its representatives in the Senate if a majority of them should antagonize the President and embrace the cause of Clark, Hearst, Murphy and Underwood.

Free Transfers in Brooklyn.

The Brooklyn Rapid Transit Company's acceptance of the Public Service Commission's transfer order is much more sensible than a fight against it would have been. It proves that the commission isn't half as outrageous as the company has said it was in combating the issuance of the order, and that the company itself isn't as unreasonable as it would seem to be at times.

Under this order there will be a practically universal transfer system on the company's lines. This will be a great convenience to the public, and the company will be no loser by living up to its function of serving the public well.

The Extra Session's Appropriation Bill.

Governor Glynn can talk from now until the extra session of the Legislature convenes in an effort to unload blame for it on the Republican Assembly, and he won't accomplish anything. All his statements will not alter the fact that the Senate would not pass the appropriation bill because it set aside no money for the Fire Marshal's office and the Department of Efficiency and Economy, two departments loaded to the muzzle with Democratic jobholders. The public is in possession of the facts, and the Governor's defence of the Tammany-controlled Senate will not help the Senate or him.

It is a good thing that the appropriations are to be considered in an extra session, if this issue of economy is to become political. The state is spending too much money, and most of the voters have a shrewd suspicion that a lot of it goes to politicians who don't work and to politician-contractors who don't do the work they promise to do. The extra session should not be encumbered with general legislation. For the first time in years the framing of an appropriation bill will be the chief thing before the lawmakers.

Under those circumstances political pull should have little chance to work the treasury, and the public should have a chance to see that it gets its money's worth. The Assembly leaders have promised to draft a rigidly economic bill, scientific in its paring down of department estimates to the last dollar. If they do that they will give the state a service it has sorely needed for years and

they will be upheld by the public regardless of the number of politicians whom they add to the ranks of the unemployed.

The Police and I. W. W.

Probably the police were brutal in repressing the I. W. W. demonstration on Saturday, and those who were should be brought to account by the city authorities; but what else could the I. W. W. have expected? In the game of police baiting the police have all the advantage. They cannot be attacked by stump speakers and held up as horrible examples, and, worst of all, they cannot be put to a lot of extra work, without itching to use their clubs upon those who are making trouble for them. Personal feeling went into the handling of the I. W. W. by the police, and this is an element which will always go into the reckoning, no matter how fair a city administration tries to be.

And in settling their score the police had everything on their side. They were dealing with men who had broken the law against parading, under exactly similar circumstances only a few days ago, and who were always threatening to violate the law and always on the edge of violating it. They were also dealing with men for whom the public had not the slightest degree of sympathy. They thus took very small chances in using their clubs.

It is no wonder that the experienced heads of the I. W. W. leave this business of nagging the police to young volunteers like Tannenbaum and O'Carroll. They know its risks.

New York Needs a State Constabulary.

The Sheriff of Erie County, who was obliged to call on the state militia for aid in suppressing disorder due to the strike at Depew, speaks from practical experience when he says that what the situation really called for was not a militia regiment, but a small body of mounted constabulary. The militia is a clumsy and costly instrument to use in dealing with strike lawlessness. It is a sacrifice for the men to go out on such duty, and to mobilize a regiment, with all its staff equipment, means undue expense to the state.

A trained constabulary, about the size of Pennsylvania's, could be maintained here the year round for little more than it might cost to suppress a single big strike disturbance. The men would get to the spot promptly, be prepared for business as soon as they got there and handle threatening strikers with an ease and firmness born of familiarity with their work. It has been Pennsylvania's experience that fifty to one hundred troopers were worth more in a strike emergency than a whole regiment of the state guard.

Lawlessness in the interior of a big state like New York can best be held in check by a special constabulary. This body could also be used for guarding the roads and the forest reservations and for many other public purposes besides keeping order when strikes break out. It would be a valuable permanent investment. When will the Legislature awake to the necessity of creating such a force?

The English Magazines and Canada.

English magazine publishers are worried by the demand of the Canadian government that magazine mail rates shall be adjusted so as to throw more of the cost of transportation on the English postoffice. If the English government raises the present rate the English publishers foresee a narrowing of their field in Canada. The editor of "The Quarterly Review" urges the authorities in London to make sacrifices in order to appease the Canadian postoffice, adding: "In the interests of this country and the empire it would probably be well to do all we can to encourage the influx of British literature into that one of our dominions which is most open to attack from its neighbors, whether by literary means or others."

The spreading influence of the American magazines in Canada is dreaded, just as is the influence of our rapidly growing trade with the Dominion. It is but another phase of the problem of keeping Canada loyal to British ideas and British products. The differential of 33 1/3 per cent in tariff duties in favor of British imports has not interfered with the steady increase of trade with the United States. Even should the British government offer to carry British magazines free to Canada it is not likely that the invasion of American reading matter would be checked. Our publications are nearer the Canadian taste than British publications are. We are all the time enlarging our friendly relations with Canada because we are growing closer together economically, socially and intellectually. Leaving out the question of political sovereignty, we are fast becoming kindred peoples, divided by an almost vanishing line.

That narrow barrier between good neighbors means little compared to the barrier which separates Canada from the unfamiliar mother country, three thousand miles across the sea.

The Reserve Rule in Baseball.

The baseball "war" of 1914 will certainly have the effect of dispelling the mystery which has hung about the celebrated "reserve rule." That rule has held good in the last decade largely because there was no practical benefit to be gained by a player who felt like disputing it. All the desirable employers were banded together within the circle of "organized baseball," and a player who wanted to "jump" had nowhere to "jump" to but the ranks of the unemployed or the impecunious "bush" leagues.

The creation of the Federal League has given a more fluid value to the services of first class players, and the courts will soon have to make it clear whether or not the reserve clause holds an employee whose primary contract has expired. In Hot Springs, Ark., Chancellor J. P. Henderson has just handed down a decision which, in an obiter dictum fashion, hints at the invalidity of the present reserve system. The chancellor issued an injunction forbidding Camnitz, a Federal League agent, to tamper with players under contract to the Pittsburgh club, but said that if a player himself had come into court to challenge the reserve rule the present reserve contract might have to be declared void.

According to this judge, a reserve contract allowing the club to discharge a player on ten days' notice, but giving the player no right to discharge himself on the same terms, is unequal in application, and therefore not binding. The reserve rule has never had a satisfactory test. It enforced itself in the era of air-tight combination. That it will stand in the new era of open bidding is very doubtful.

It seems to be Mr. Glynn's ambition to write his name on the proud list of Democratic Governors just below that of John A. Dix.

Despite a gripe, it is announced that Mr. Bryan will be back at his office promptly. And on the circuit as soon as the weather permits, doubtless.

The Conning Tower

BALLADE OF HAS-BEEN LORDS.

(Villon, to S. of J.)

What more? Where rests Steve Brodie, he
Of that great name who took a fall
Into the river scathlessly?
And Manuel of Portugal?
Methinks he married—and that's all.
Where's old Doc. Cook, who stung the Dane,
Who stuck him with that North Pole staff?
Perhaps they sleep with Charlemagne!

Fortino, who hastily
Departed for the land of Gaul
From climes where Villa's villany
Shouts captured foes against a wall?
And T. McGovern, swift and small?
And Sockalexis, late of Maine,
Who ran full fast and played base-ball?
Perhaps they sleep with Charlemagne!

The list would stretch from sea to sea,
But vain to write the whole roll-call
Of those who die in memory.
For never gods we soon install
In each black niche. Beneath what thrall
Lies Hobson, he who flouted Spain?
O'er John A. Dix who spreads the pall?
Perhaps they sleep with Charlemagne!

LENOXI.
Where is that lighter, lean and tall
Whom men once cheered as Jake Kilrain?
And where is Lamson's frenzied equal?
Perhaps they sleep with Charlemagne!

DEPOSITION.

(By our Eusey to the Tower for the benefit of the few
curious souls who have not asked him about it.)
He looks quite like other people.
He did not put me in the Diary.
No, he really seems quite busy.
We don't get paid for doing it.
Yes, it's a lot of fun.
About thirty-five, I should say.
I didn't ask him.

SPEAKING EVE EDGARTONELY.

(Nouns, pronouns, verbs and articles by Our Cor.;
adjectives and adverbs by Eleanor Hallouell
Abbott.)

Shruggingly, Eve Edgarton, in duddy-looking
dresses.

Freakishly, is tangled up in crescendish messes,
Laggingly, to her at last the man his love confesses.

Singsongily, she drones at him, the while they ride
together

Frowningly and edgily, she talks about the weather,
Blurrishly, stale lightning fares and smites him to
the heather.

Crampishly, thisherenow bard is driven to express
Soggily, opinions that's his harder than you'd guess
Adverbial-participially, to ape the authoress.

LULLABY.

The night doth close thy drowsy eyes,
Sleep, baby, sleep.
On dreaming wings drift to the skies,
Sleep, baby, sleep.
Thy father's at a tango joint,
Thy mother does the dip and point.
(Oh, OH, OH, that sand-man rag!)
Sleep, baby, sleep.

EASTER PARADE.

HIGHCOSTOFLIVING, IN SPEED-CAR.

ELI COLTUM EDITORS, IN LOCKSTEP.

MARY RICHARDSON, HOLDING THE ROBERT

VENUS.

ANTHONY COMSTOCK, PURSUING WITH BATH

TOWEL.

H.M. GEORGE V. ARM IN ARM WITH SIR EDWARD

CARSON AND BONAR LAW.

ULSTER VOLUNTEERS.

POLICE RESERVES AND SEVENTH REGIMENT.

IRISH VOLUNTEERS.

FIRE CHIEF KENLON, IN EVENING DRESS.

STREET COMMISSIONER FETHERSTON, IN RUBBER

BOOTS, CARRYING A BRIGHT NEW SHOVEL.

PAUL POIRET, IN A STAR-SPANGLED KIMONO.

GENERAL VILLA, CARRYING BUNCH OF JONQUILS.

PATHE FRERES CHASSEURS D'APRIQUE.

THOSE BACK-FIRING FERRYBOATS!

Sir: If you miss the little ferryboat that plies
over the harbor here to Hamilton, you whistle and
the pilot courteously steers round and comes back
for you. Makes one homesick for Phila, the great
Penn. city.
West Paget, Bermuda.

Per Pica ad Astra.

Mica, mica, O Capella,
Sirius, Venusque bella,
Mihl sed optime stelle
Orbes sunt carae puellae.

Nomen me loqui velisne?
Soror una est—Credisne?

(Nescio Latium bene,
Sed Latium facit Colym
Eridrum vero.)

ASIRA MEA.

"Buy my bonds," weeps "Chick" Evans, "or else I
can't go to England and play golf!"
"Sit at my table," whines our waiter, "or else I'll
have to use my last year's touring car!"
"Let me play every game," sob the raw-boned re-
cruit, "or else no engagement in vaudeville for me
next Fall!"
"Purchase our services as col. eds.," we beg tear-
fully, "or else we'll have to start in as cub re-
porters!"

"A knowledge of typewriting is an essential part of
the equipment of a journalist,"—S. OF J. CATALOGUE.

I've pounded on my underwood
my nits are out of joint
But still I can't find that
Simple e-clamation point!

What if I CAN write % & \$
and cut up other tricks
I never can locate the key
TO end my sorry life.

TO THAT DIMINUTIVE GUY WITH MANSARD
SHOULDER.

That coat you're wearing, little man,
Do you call it Balmacaan?
Why, what's all that fuss you're makin'
Oh, he'd rather say Balmacaan!

PERHAPS LEONIA OR ELIZABETH!
(From the Globe.)

He said they were married two weeks ago in New Jersey,
but didn't say where or what his bride's maiden name was.

FINALE.

Blaze at our serried colym, blaze!
Soak, knock and scum, use it all!
The target stands before your gaze.
In open order, fire at will!

But though, perhaps, we've bungled things
Far more than A. I. col. eds. should,
Hear! Ere we dive behind the wings,
We think our stuff is Gol-Darned GOOD.

Business of bowing, ready to dodge.

Quick curtain.

THE COLUMBIA SCHOOL OF JOURNALISM.

THERE'S WHAT I CALL A PUBLIC BENEFACTOR!



THE PEOPLE'S COLUMN

An Open Forum for Public Debate.

TAMMANY AND THE TOLLS VOTE

It Wasn't Murphy's Fault That New York Wasn't Solid Against President.

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: I am grieved to see The Tribune fall into error and call Congressman William Kent, of California, a Republican. Mr. Kent ran as an independent against a regularly nominated Republican candidate, as you can see by the Tribune Almanac for 1914.

Your statement that Tammany was against Wilson in the recent Panama Canal discussion is not borne out by the facts. There are thirty-one Tammany Congressmen from this state, and fifteen voted against President Wilson, but fifteen men are not a majority of thirty-one.

Will The Tribune kindly correct its errors which have been committed in the defence of President Wilson's treachery? GEORGE W. WAGNER.
No. 5 West 124 street, New York City, April 1, 1914.

[Mr. Wagner is right in saying that Mr. Kent was not properly classified in the Washington dispatches summarizing the vote on the Sims bill. There are thirty-one Democrats in the House of Representatives from this state, but it is hardly correct to say that they are all Tammany men. Lathrop Brown, Jefferson M. Levy and Henry George, from the metropolitan district, would not accept that designation, and there are upstate Democratic Representatives who are not rubber stamps for Murphy. Mr. Loft and Mr. Cantor, though nominated by Murphy, are not absolutely controlled by him. All the dyed-in-the-wool Tammany Congressmen from this state voted with Clark and Underwood and against the President.—Ed.]

SLAVERY IN GERMAN EAST AFRICA

Its Patriarchal Character Is Held Scant Excuse.

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: The civilization of the twentieth century assuredly is retrograde. No greater emphasis can be given to this fact than the tenor of the reported article from Berlin, in the Tribune of Sunday, March 22, last. In this report slavery in the German African colonies is defended by the "Governor of the German East African Colonies." Nothing more contradictory to the title "Most Christian Majesty" the Emperor of Germany nor more deteriorating to the character of the Reichstag can be conceived of than that slavery has been allowed to continue to exist, even in "patriarchal character" until to-day.

Granting that gradual emancipation may have been the better way, why have the wheels of justice turned so sluggishly in the consciences of a Christian sovereign and a professedly Christian nation? The slaves in German Africa may not be discontented, because they know nothing better.

Has it been impossible to avoid continuing slavery of the "men of color" until the year 1920, or until practically slavery may wear itself out, from increasing death rate or decreasing birth rate, by the year 1920? From six to sixteen years more, at least, in bondage—"slave property." Only a trifle, compared to the serious consideration that their immediate emancipation would cost the German government the amount of \$2,000,000 to indemnify the owners for the loss of their property—meaning the bodies and souls of their fellow-men with dark skins! Rather than expend \$2,000,000 of good money for so small a matter it is more satisfactory and comfortable to Emperor, Reichstag and slaveholder to continue slavery in German Africa.

There is but a thin film of apologetic justification when the Governor writes that "the negroes feel no hardships in their slavery." They are even "fed" and sheltered by their owners when they are no longer able to slave for them!

What a heavenly, generous, loving kindness!

If freedom for the African slave will endanger tribal uprisings, as is suggested in the "report," surely an effective, disciplined army of such Germans as we know constitute the German regular army could serve in no more noble cause than to move against such an element which would insure the absolute emancipation of God's children with dark skins but white souls.

"Is it nothing to you, all ye that pass by?" M. C. MARSH.
New York, April 1, 1914.

EFFECTS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Are the Sweatshop and the Tango Among Them?

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: C. L. Matthews, in to-day's Tribune, reminds us that the predictions of sixty years ago have been realized—"that higher education for women and the extension of their property rights would result eventually in taking women out of the home, in lessening man's respect for her, in discouraging young men from marrying and in increasing marital discord." He asks: "But is it not a fact, nevertheless, that to-day the sweatshop, the factory, the store, the office and the tango hall shelter more women than the home?" That is, that higher education and extension of property rights to women have filled the sweatshops, the factory, the store, the office and the tango hall.

Glad to be informed. We supposed these places were filled with girls who had not the "college education and possession of property." We supposed that women with education and property commanded greater "respect of men" and that the possession of property did not "discourage young men from marrying." We supposed that more women who had higher education and property were to be found in the home than of those who had not higher education and property. Also, we did not know that the few years that woman suffrage has existed in a few states had had this terrible effect on the whole world.

We wish to thank Mr. Matthews for enlightening us, correcting our false impressions and giving us this wise advice. RICHARD P. BRUCE.
New York, April 1, 1914.

THE EDUCATION OF WOMEN

The Masculine Assumption of Omniscience Stirs a Reader.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: It is difficult for any one who believes in progress and civilization to seriously answer Mr. C. L. Matthews's remarkable suggestion that women are no better off than they were before they were permitted by their male superiors to have education. He, I suppose, makes a sex question of this, and thereby insults, unintentionally perhaps, the women of the world. He can hardly, I think, believe that the race has gained nothing by the male evolution from the fig leaf-club period to the present civilization. If he believes men were better and happier when they were nearer the brute than they are to-day his argument and question are legitimate for discussion; if he implies that men are elected for progress, but that women are not, then, I repeat, such a question as his becomes mere insult and should shame him by the inference it implies.

Through education and experience alone can we hope for realization of the best that is in us. If women, as well as men, are still struggling, it is because they are alive, even after the deadening weight of such prejudice as Mr. Matthews's, and see that there is still something to desire—something that must be obtained.

This correspondent objects to "glittering generalities," and we women object to the eternal sex limitations that always assume that the male has vision and assurance that enable him not only to know

what is good for himself and the race, but to assume authority over others, proclaiming a superiority which he dares not put to the only test that can possibly set at rest forever the much abused question, namely: Fair field, no favors, and a sportsmanlike observance of the rules!

HARRIET T. COMSTOCK.
Matrush, April 1, 1914.

THE CITIZENSHIP OF WIVES.

The Case of the American Who Marries an Alien Is Discussed.

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: Referring to the fears entertained by several suffrage leaders regarding their loss of citizenship and right to vote "so long as their husbands fail to become naturalized," I beg to say that their fears are entirely groundless, and that when the right of suffrage is given to women, which I hope will be very soon, they will be entitled to vote regardless of the citizenship of their husbands.

The question of the citizenship of a woman who is an American citizen when married to a foreigner has been considered many times by the judicial and executive departments.

In 1852 Attorney General Bates ruled that a woman born in the United States, who married a Spanish subject and then removed with her husband to Spain, where she lived until his death, was not divested of American citizenship.

In 1871 Solicitor General Phillips decided "that the marriage of an alien-born woman to a naturalized citizen of the United States conferred on her the permanent status of American citizenship, defeasible only as in cases of other persons, and that her subsequent marriage with an alien did not affect this status."

In 1883 the United States Circuit Court of Louisiana held "that a woman native citizen of Louisiana who married an Italian subject was still a citizen of the United States after her husband's death. That expatriation by a woman can only be affected by removal from this country, and that in the absence of any act of Congress authorizing it there can be no implied renunciation of American citizenship by an American woman marrying an alien."

This subject was discussed at length by Secretary of State Fish in his instructions to our ambassador in Paris in 1871: "By the law of England and the United States an alien woman on her marriage with a subject or citizen merges her nationality in that of her husband. But the converse has never been established as the law of the United States, and only by an act of Parliament passed May 12, 1870, did it become British law that an English woman lost her quality as a British subject by marrying an alien."

"The Continental codes, on the other hand, enable a woman whose nationality has been changed by marriage to resume it when she becomes a widow, on condition, however, of her returning to the country of her origin."

And again when he wrote to the President in 1873, as follows: "The marriage of a female citizen of the United States with a foreign subject of a country by whose laws marriage confers citizenship upon the wife of its subject, and her removal to and residence in the country of her husband's citizenship, would divest her of her native character of an American citizen."

These views were concurred in by Secretary Blaine in 1880 and Acting Secretary Uhl in 1885 when similar questions came up for their consideration.

Secretary Hay ruled in 1889 that a divorce has the same effect as the death of the husband upon the citizenship of the woman.

As long, therefore, as these ladies continue to reside in the United States they need not fear that their citizenship will in any way be affected by the citizenship of their husbands, and to that extent at least our laws "are not just a sample of the general law of civil disabilities of women the world over."

LOUIS LANDIE.
New York, April 1, 1914.